Approved For Release 2005/08/16 : CIA-RDP70B00338R000300040035-3

Mrs. Louis Hirsch, Tucson, Ariz.
Mrs. John D. Kenderdine, Holtwood, Pa.
Mrs. Colin J. Macdonald, Dallas, Tex.
Mrs. K. E. Montgomery, Eugene, Oreg.
Mrs. W. Eugene Pharis, Webster Groves, Mo.
Mrs. Haskell Rosenblum, Washington, D.C.
Mrs. Vernon C. Stoneman, Belmont, Mass.
Mrs. John F. Toomey, Narragansett, R.I.
Mrs. Robert Zurbach, Pasadena, Calif.
Mrs. George A. Little, of Old Greenwich, Conn., league observer to the United Nations, also attended.

Consular Conv. file

Why the United States-U.S.S.R. Consular Treaty Should Be Rejected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is a professor of economics at Georgetown University and chairman of the National Captive Nations Week Committee, has written a scholarly article on the proposed consular treaty between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a portion of the article, in which Dr. Dobriansky discusses four reasons for rejecting the treaty:

VII. BASIS FOR INTENSIFIED POLITICAL WARFARE IN LATIN AMERICA

Speaking of ramifications emerging from a shortsighted ratification of the treaty, the next four reasons for nonratification indicate what we can expect from this further appeasement of Soviet Russian desires. It should be evident now to the reader that all of these reasons against ratification are integrally related, though any one is sufficient cause for rejecting the treaty. To the recurring distinction made between the treaty as a body of guidelines for consular activity and the actual establishment of the consulates, which some even suggest the State Department might act upon devoid of any treaty, one can reasonably maintain the virtual inseparability of the two and the political certainty of no consulars if these many reasons, individually, in combination or as an integral whole, lead to a Senate rejection of the pact.

Thus, the seventh reason for nonratification is that a Senate confirmation of this treaty would open up a Pandora's Box of Soviet Russian pressure against every free government in Latin America. The immediate objective would be similar consular conventions; the ultimate objective would be a really intensified political warfare in the area. This at a time when many of our own officials have been warning us to expect stepped-up Red subversion throughout the continent.

Strangely enough, this reason against ratification was scarcely brought up in the August discussion. Few even knew that as of now no U.S.S.R. consulates exist in the Western Hemisphere. In a cogent rebuttal to a newspaper editorial, Congressman DERWINSKI stated the case eloquently: "Acquiescence of the United States to Soviet consulates would set an obvious precedent that would soon find the Communist rulers of Moscow spreading their influence in Latin America by means of consular activities. What Latin American government could refuse the request for a consulate after the leader of the free world has extended this benefit to the rulers of the Kremlin?" [39]

Need more be said on this point of consular proliferation for extended Red subversion in the Western Hemisphere? The ratification of the treaty would create a solid basis for intensified Russian political warfare in Latin America. As in the area of trade with the Red empire, or lack of firm and consistent policy will be another government's rationalization for its actions under pressure.

VIII. A TRADE WEDGE

Another reason for not ratifying the pact is the obvious use made of this treaty as a diplomatic wedge to liberalize and increase trade with the Soviet Union and the Red empire in general. Time and time again in his testimony Mr. Rusk spoke of the prospect of "increasing trade between our two countries." [40] At times it appears this argument of dollars and cents carried more weight with him than the argument of humane protection for Americans in the U.S.S.R.

The issue of increased trade with the U.S.S.R. and the Red empire is a controversial problem in and of itself. This writer has pointed out in testimony and in emphatic terms that any such liberalized trade would not be the first time the United States has contributed myopically to the economic strengthening of the Soviet Russian empire—always, of course, in the interests of "peace," "normal relations," "relaxation of tensions," and other self-legitimations.[41] Up to now those seeking such East-West trade have been careful to distinguish between our trading more liberally with the captive states in Central Europe and that with the U.S.S.R. The former is supposed to unlatch these Red totalitarian states from the chains of Russian domination, though for years Moscow itself has pursued the empire policy of division of national labor.

Now, curiously enough, we see Secretary Rusk injecting the trade issue into this consular one with evident abandon of the distinction mentioned above. Our fighting men in South Vietnam should take great comfort in this switch since economic-trade support of the U.S.S.R. should in turn bolster Moscow's support of Hanoi for an even more challenging conflict in that area.

The fragmented policy of our Government conduces to many blatant contradictions. This tactic of arguing for the treaty on the basis of trade prospects which in turn would facilitate the economic means of Moscow's global cold war operations against our interests is a gem of policymaking fragmentism. It's cause enough to reject the treaty as a trade wedge.

IX. THE MOST-FAVORED-NATION SIEVE

As in the area of trade with the Red empire, the most-favored-nation sieve exists in consular agreements. This ninth reason for not ratifying the treaty was emphasized by several scrutinizing Senators who wisely oppose the extension of the immunity eprivilege to 27 other nations and states, including Yugoslavia and Rumania.[42] As they pointed out, as many as 400 consular personnel would be eligible under the treaty and their covering conventions with the most-favored-nation clause for immunity from prosecution for all crimes.

On this point Secretary Rusk affirmed that "others would have the right to raise with us establishing various privileges, but only on a basis of reciprocity." [43] It is interesting that this concern for reciprocity shows itself here but not with the protection of American citizens in the U.S.S.R. on the ambassadorial or full diplomatic level. With this sieve the risks mentioned earlier become all the more magnified. Also, Red governments with no consular agreements at present would also seek the inclusion of the most-favored-nation clause in any future conventions.

The snowball effects of the treaty's provisions are thus not difficult to determine. They all point to a substantial net disadvantage for us. Recently, for example, our officials have uttered some tart remarks with regard to Japan's apathy toward the Vietnam war and its warm behavior toward the Red Empire. Encouraged by our action, Japan, too, is on the road to signing a consular agreement with the U.S.S.R.[44] If in short time it judges the U.S.S.R. to be a far greater threat to the free world than Red China could possibly be in the next decade, it would have a self-legitimating basis for establishing similar and probably closer relations with Peiping.

X. THE BALTIC DILEMMA

A final reason for nonratification bears on the Baltic dilemma to which the treaty exposes us. This reason is logically a derivative of the second reason we considered, as well as being based on an act of U.S. policy. The United States does not recognize the forced incorporation of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia in the U.S.S.R. Yet, despite the silent treatment proferred by the State Department's legal counsel, any consular activity in these Republics cannot but in practice and in time constitute de facto recognition.[45] With the allowable establishment of consular districts there, this condition would become crystal clear. At least Secretary Rusk admitted, "We do have a bit of a dilemma there, Senator." [46]

In conclusion, there are many dilemmas, contradictions, and risks posed by this consular convention. From Moscow's viewpoint, as an instrument of the cold war it is fraught without innumerable advantages—imperial legitimacy, propaganda, legacies, political warfare penetrations, espionage, and so forth. Our viewpoint is already so beclouded that many cannot see a real diplomatic alternative to this disadvantageous arrangement which would satisfy most of the reasons given for ratification of the convention, including the inadequacy of our Embassy in Moscow, and yet realize a substantial net advantage.

Before alternatives can be examined, the treaty itself should be subjected to full, critical examination. This has not as yet been done. The question is a simple one: Blind ratification or open, public hearings?

Footnotes at end of speech.

[39] Edward J. Derwinski, "The Consular Treaty," the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Aug. 27, 1965.
[40] E.g. "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," p. 33.
[41] Lev E. Dobriansky, "Five Perspectives on East-West Trade," "East-West Trade," hearings, pt. II, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, 1965, pp. 94–104.
[42] "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," minority views, p. 4.
[43] "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," p. 23.
[44] "Japan, Russia Are Negotiating," Reauters, Moscow, June 10, 1965.
[45] "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," p. 26.
[46] Ibid, p. 25.

Letter From Chester R. Lindsey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Alliance Witness, the official organ of the Christian and Missionary Alliance, in its issue for February 2,

Approved For Release 2005/08/16 : CIA-RDP70B00338R000300040035-3

Approved For Release 2005/08/16 : CIA-RDP70B00338R000300040035-3

1966, has published a letter from Lt. Col. Chester R. Lindsey, division chaplain, for the 1st Cavalry Division, now in Vietnam, to the Christian and Missionary Alliance. This letter is a tribute to the work of missionaries in Vietnam from the chaplains and military personnel of the 1st Air Cavalry Division. They are so interested in furthering the work of the Christian and Missionary Alliance in Vietnam that they have made a substantial contribution to the voluntary missionary effort in that country.

In recent days our Government through the Declaration of Honolulu has indicated that we are going to give priority to economic and social welfare programs in South Vietnam even as the military effort continues. This letter indicates that in addition to this governmental effort the heroic and sacrificial effort of Christian missionaries in South Vietnam in establishing church buildings and ministering to the spiritual needs of the people is also going to be a vital part of the important effort of reconstructing a war-torn country. I take this opportunity to express my personal gratitude both for the work of the missionaries in South Vietnam, and also for the service of our faithful chaplains. I read somewhere recently that attendance at chapel services by our men in South Vietnam is almost 100 percent. To me this is one of the most encouraging bits of news to come out of the war zone in a long time. For it indicates that our fighting men feel a spiritual hunger and need even as they carry out the difficult tasks that fall to them as soldiers, sailors and airmen in the service of their country.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include with my remarks a copy of Lieutenant Colonel Lindsey's letter.

HEADQUARTERS, 1ST CAVALRY DIVISION (AIRMOBILE), OFFICE OF THE DIVISION CHAPLAIN,
APO San Francisco, December 16, 1965.

The CHRISTIAN AND MISSIONARY ALLIANCE,
260 West 44th Street,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: Our chaplains and the military personnel of the 1st Air Cavalry Division in Vietnam have become acquainted with many of the missionaries and have observed the work which they are doing.

We have received an offering at our chapel services and present this check for $696.75 for the work of the Christian and Missionary Alliance in Vietnam.

We have become acquainted with the work of Rev. and Mrs. Chester E. Travis, of Qui Nhon. We request the offering be designated for their work in order that they may assist the Christians of this Province in establishing church buildings in locations within this Province where refugees may be relocated and churches need to be established.

Although we are aware that all of your work is vital and filling a real need, we would be grateful if this offering could be used for the purpose stated above.

With every good wish for continued success in your work, I remain

Sincerely yours,

CHESTER R. LINDSEY,
Chaplain (Lieutenant Colonel) U.S. Army, Division Chaplain.

The Miami Business and Professional Women's Club Celebrate 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday the Miami Business and Professional Women's Club will celebrate its 50th anniversary of service to the south Florida community.

It is often remarked that behind every successful man there stands a woman. It is no less true of a city. During the last half century, while our globe was steadily shrinking, Miami has been busy growing from a small village to one of America's greatest cities with a population now over 1 million. Behind this growth has stood a dedicated, hard-working group of women—the Miami Business and Professional Women's Club. The contribution made by Miami's business and professional women, both as individuals and as members of their club is immeasurable.

Mr. Speaker, these 50 years of achievement are a source of pride to all of us in Miami, but they must especially be so for the women who have so ably lead the group over the years, including Mrs. Marjory Stoneman Douglas, who first organized the group in 1916, the current president Mrs. Florence M. Yoder, and Mrs. Edna Van Acker, twice past president and anniversary chairman.

I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate them and all the members of the Miami Business and Professional Women's Club on a job well done.

BUSINESS, PROFESSIONAL WOMEN OBSERVE THEIR 50TH BIRTHDAY

Miami Business and Professional Women's Club will light 50 birthday candles on February 12 at the Everglades Hotel. Actually the birth date was February 2, 1916, but the Saturday evening event was chosen for the convenience of guests from many places.

Chief hostesses will be the club's first president, Mrs. Marjory Stoneman Douglas (1916–17) and the current leader, Mrs. Florence M. Yoder (1964–66). Past President Mrs. Edna Van Acker (1944–46 and 1960–62) is anniversary chairman.

Official emissary from the Florida Federation of Women's Clubs is the State president, Della Rosenberg, of Starke. She will attend with other officers, district directors, and committee chairmen.

Minnesota-born Mrs. Douglas, a young welfare worker and writer from Massachusetts, arrived in south Florida in 1915 just in time to help charter the new club.

It was named the Business and Professional Women's League. Organizer and promoter was Alice Luebig, a telephone company supervisor who served as "club mother" throughout her lifetime.

When the national federation came into being at St. Louis in 1919 the Miami women changed their club's name and joined the new federation. Club history has been woven into that of the community ever since.

There were problems. During the early years of World War I there was no suitable place for the women to meet or eat.

Friends and ingenuity helped on the club decision to go into its own cafeteria. A tiny cottage was rented where lunches could be prepared, cooked, and served. With a later move into larger quarters the cafeteria facilities were opened to the public.

From the sale of that cafeteria ($700) plus $300 more from the club treasury, the Young Women's Christian Association received $1,000 for its building fund. It helped pay for the former Fort Dallas Hotel which became the YWCA home at 108 SE. Second Avenue in 1920.

The hurricane of 1926 brought property and job losses. Many BPW members left the city; membership dropped from an all-time high of 225 to a new low. Then the Oakland, Calif., BPW Club sent a check for $100 to the Miami club, for assistance to members.

"It was a gift that will not be forgotten by early-day members who learned just how big a $100 check could look," says a club historian.

When Mary V. Morris (retired) was president (1925–27) the Hialeah Business and Professional Women's Clubs (now Hialeah-Miami Springs) was organized by the Miami Club shortly after the hurricane. Clarissa Greene (also retired), a reporter for the Miami Daily News & Metropolis had signed up prospective members discovered during her posthurricane coverage for her paper.

Miami BPW Club became interested in scholarships by 1928 when Catherine Shelley Walsh, owner-operator of the Walsh School of Business Science, established one in the name of the club and maintained it for several years.

Then the club's scholarship loan fund was formed. During Miss Walsh's term as president (1933–35) the problems of Miami unemployed women were taken to emergency relief officials and the problems of juveniles were studied by active participation in the juvenile court council.

Among other needs, cleaner picture shows were sought, laws affecting women were studied and a registry maintained of unemployed club members.

One of the club's most important galas was a reception in honor of club member Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde prior to her departure for Europe as Minister to Denmark (1933–36).

Credit goes again to Miss Greene, and to Mrs. Faye Sherman (president, 1937–38), for establishment of a Red Cross highway emergency first aid station 40 miles west of Miami on the Tamiami Trail. During the first year 38 accident victims were treated there.

During the World War II years members served in every type of duty; bond and Red Cross drives. The Miami BPW Club decorated, equipped, and managed one of the largest USO services in the area in the old City Club. Many members served from the opening to the closing of the censorship office.

During Mrs. Van Acker's first term dues went up to $10, $3 into the Miami BPW building fund, for a long dreamed-of clubhouse not yet realized. In 1965 the club incorporated in order to be able to buy and maintain a clubhouse—at some future date.

Throughout the years the club has maintained a membership in the Dade County Crime Commission, begun during the term of the late Louise Simmons. Twenty-seven club members were charter signers of the

Approved For Release 2005/08/16 : CIA-RDP70B00338R000300040035-3